

## **Judy Meyer's comments on stressor memo 1/20/11**

1. p. 1 – We need to have some discussion about what it is we are promising for mid-March. What additional material would we include in what we are writing in a longer document? Before we promise this, I think we need to agree on the kinds of things we are going to attempt to include in that and decide whether that additional information/analysis is really needed and the best way to use our time. I will not be able to participate in the call (I will be on an airplane or waiting for one), but at the moment I am not convinced of the need for it (perhaps because I do not have a clear vision of what it would cover). I can be convinced otherwise, but I need a better understanding of what we are proposing to produce.
2. p. 1-2, point 1: I think it is important to state that we have looked widely to see how others are approaching this difficult problem. Therefore I would like to see us add a sentence like the following: "...difficult. The ISB investigated approaches being used to identify and prioritize stressors in other large ecosystem management projects in the US and other countries; all are struggling with this. Nonetheless ..."
3. p. 4: Sometimes my computer does strange things with diagrams, so maybe that is what has happened here. I do not understand what the arrows above the circles are supposed to represent. I also don't understand the purpose for the ovals. That needs explanation in the text. I don't see that having words and arrows in ovals is any improvement over just words and arrows – but perhaps that is because I have not been told what the ovals are supposed to be conveying.
4. p. 5 bottom: Take out the reference to the wastewater discharge parenthetical phrase "(e.g., ammonia discharge from waste treatment plants)". It is not likely that the plant will be upgraded before the Delta Plan is finalized, and the limits that have been put on discharges may not be adequate. Take it out!!! I feel VERY strongly about this one. In fact I don't think that whole sentence should be in there. I don't agree with it. It presumes that the actions we are currently taking will have the effect that we predict, and there is no certainty in that. Our later discussion of not being able to predict system response to stressor alteration, particularly in light of the changing Delta, is a direct contradiction of the point being made in this paragraph. Similarly with point 8 – if there are going to be surprises, current management actions may suffer reduced effectiveness. The paragraph needs significant modification. I don't have a problem putting the future first. I do have a problem leaving out the present.
5. p. 8 Figure and explanatory paragraph: The figure is not needed and explanation is too technical. It is very different from the rest of the letter. The paragraph needs to begin with a general statement of the point being made – "that species or ecosystem processes may not respond as expected to changing stressors". Then a sentence to the effect that it is common for responses observed as stressors increase to be different than responses observed as stressors decrease. Then a verbal description of the example using a common name for charophytes.

6. p. 9, point 7: I think we could point out that many of the other ecosystem management projects that we examined used models to help guide decision-making and explore potential decision outcomes through carefully constructed scenario analyses.

In general, Dick and Mike have done a great job pulling this letter together. As I said above, I will not be able to participate in the call. The items that concern me the most are covered in my comments #1, 4, and 5. You will have a hard time convincing me that these changes are not needed.